

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/611,913	07/07/2000	Clifford E. Kahn	EMC00-03(00011)	7737

7590 08/16/2004  
Barry W Chapin Esq  
Chapin & Huang LLC  
Westborough Office Park  
1700 West Park Drive  
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2136

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/611,913	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAHN, CLIFFORD E.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Carl Colin	<b>Art Unit</b> 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-22,24-39 and 41-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-22,24-39 and 41-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 May 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. In response to communications filed on 5/20/2004, Applicant cancels claims 5, 23, and 40 and amends claims 1, 6, 19, 22, 24, 37, 38, and 43. Applicant adds claims 46-57. The following **claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-39, 41-57** are presented for examination.
2. The amendments to the specification, pages 20-23 and the abstract on page 24, filed on 5/20/2004 have been considered. The objection to the specification and the drawing has been withdrawn with respect to the amended drawing and specifications. The objection to claims 22, 37, and 43 has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's remarks, pages 25- 37, filed on 5/20/2004, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-45 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Regarding amended claims 1, 19, and 38, Applicant states that Bapat does not disclose, "selecting based on the access request a selected set of rules". Examiner respectfully asserts that Bapat discloses the claimed invention as claimed. Bapat recites that when the user access request is a select statement, it invokes a control access procedure that uses a set of access rights stored in at least one permissions table... for instance (see claim 9) which meets the recitation of selecting set of rules. The Office action recites column 11, lines 51-67 and column 27 showing that the grant rules and deny rules meet the recitation of selected set of rules as disclosed by Bapat "this structure makes it easy to define set of access rules" (column 12, lines 1-5). Bapat also discloses performing the rules such as

Art Unit: 2136

global deny rule, targeted deny rules, global grant rules, targeted allow rules successively in that order that meets the recitation of sequentially performing rule operations in each rule. Applicant also states that there is no disregard instruction (terminating the performance of any remaining rule operations). Bapat discloses performing the steps of access control rules based on permission tables in a hierarchical order unless a grant or deny decision is reached in any one step, that meets the recitation of performing less than all rule operations ... until reaching a disregard instruction thereby terminating any remaining rule operations. For instance, when reaching denying to all objects rule, there is no need to check denying to specific object rule.

Applicant states that there is no indication of rules arranged in hierarchy. Examiner respectfully asserts that rules are processed in order as discussed above. Bapat states “access control database consists of hierarchy of objects”, for example in column 5, line 19. Bapat also discloses in column 9, line 55 that rules are typically defined hierarchically with respect to groups... “the user group feature helps to greatly reduce the amount of data required to define each access rule” (lines 48-50).

Regarding claim 8, Bapat provides an example in columns 26-28 showing how remaining rules do not need to be performed as described above. For example column 28, lines 42-56 recite “if access to all objects specified in a query is denied, the query is denied without providing a detailed explanation to the user which meets the recitation of all other rules are disregarded. On the other hand if access to some object but not others is granted the access control procedure enables the user query to be executed on the objects which access is granted. See also column 29, line 60 through column 30, line 24. In another embodiment, Bapat also discloses “denying access to a user if any of the user’s group is denied access to that object”.

Regarding claim 13, the example ‘Enforcing access control’ involves conditional instruction that are performed in order; for example, a condition in step 1 must be met before step 2 that includes a disregard instruction is performed as explained above.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 19, and 38 to include the limitations of cancelled claims 5, 23, and 40 respectively. Applicant has not overcome the rejection of these claims as discussed above. Applicant also adds claims 46-57 with new limitations. Upon further consideration a new ground of rejection is made in view of Bhatt et al.. Bhatt discloses the new limitations of claims 46-57.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claim 57** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- 4.1 Claim 57 recites the limitation “wherein the performance of the IF-THEN operation...”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5.1 **Claims 1-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,236,996 to **Bapat et al.**

5.2 **As per claims 1, 19, and 38, Bapat et al.** discloses a method and a system (see figure 3) that meets the recitation of the system of claim 19 comprising input/output interface, processor, memory system encoding with authorization program, authorization database, and interconnection mechanism coupling the above list, for providing access control in a computing system environment, the method comprising the steps of receiving an access request (see column 11, lines 59); selecting, based on the access request, a selected set of rules containing at least one rule from at least one master set of rules (see column 11, lines 59-65 and column 13, lines 15-

Art Unit: 2136

57); and performing at least one rule operation in the at least one rule in the selected set of rules to produce an access control decision until at least one of: i) a rule operation including a disregard instruction is performed to limit performance of rule operations in the selected set of rules; and ii) all rule operations in the selected set of rules that are applicable to the access control decision are performed. (See column 11, lines 59-65 and column 13, lines 15-57).

**As per claims 2 and 20, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of performing includes the step of producing an access control decision indicating whether to allow access, on behalf of a requestor submitting the access request, to an resource in the computing system environment (see column 11, lines 59-65 and column 13, lines 15-57).

**As per claims 3 and 21, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of selecting includes the steps of determining an identity of the resource in the computing system environment to which access is requested in the access request; and applying at least one filter operation, using the identity of the resource, for rules in the at least one master set of rules to produce the selected set of rules for use in determining the access control decision to the resource (see column 14, lines 10-42).

**As per claims 4 and 22, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of further including the step of determining a role identity of a requestor submitting the access request (see column 15, lines 23-28 and column 16, lines 55-58); and wherein the step of applying applies the at least one filter operation, using the role identity of the requestor submitting the access request in combination



Art Unit: 2136

with the identity of the resource, for rules in the at least one master set of rules to produce the selected set of rules for use in determining the access control decision to the resource (see column 14, line 53 through column 15, line 10; see also column 16, line 55 through column 17, line 41).

**As per claims 5, 23, and 40, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein at least one rule in the selected set of rules contains a rule operation including an unconditional disregard instruction (see column 11, lines 11-23); and wherein the step of performing includes the steps of performing less than all rule operations defined within the at least one rule in the selected set of rules by sequentially performing rule operations in each rule in the selected set of rules until the unconditional disregard instruction is performed thereby terminating the performance of any remaining rule operations in the selected set of rules (see column 15, lines 28-34 and column 11, lines 11-23). (See also column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claims 6 and 24, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the selected set of rules is arranged hierarchically such that rules containing rule operations that are more specific are performed before rule operations that are more general (see column 15, lines 28-34 and column 11, lines 11-23).

**As per claims 7, 10, 25, 28, and 41, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein at least one rule in the selected set of rules contains a rule operation including a disregard instruction including disregard criteria; and wherein the step of performing limits performance of

Art Unit: 2136

rule operations in the selected set of rules by performing the disregard instruction containing disregard criteria such that at least one rule operation in any remaining rule operations in the selected set of rules is disregarded from further performance (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28). (See also column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claims 8, 11, 26, and 29, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of performing includes the steps of evaluating the disregard criteria against any remaining unperformed rule operations in the selected set of rules; and marking any remaining unperformed rule operations in the selected set of rules that match the disregard criteria to be disregarded from further rule processing (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28).

**As per claims 9, 27, and 39, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of selecting includes the steps of determining an identity of a resource in the computing system environment to which access is requested in the access request (see column 26, lines 30-40); and applying at least one filter operation, using the identity of the resource, for rules in the at least one master set of rules to produce the selected set of rules for use in determining the access control decision to the resource (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28); and wherein the method further includes the step of determining a role identity of a requestor submitting the access request (see column 26, lines 30-40); and wherein the step of performing sequentially processes each rule operation in the selected set of rules using the role identity of the requestor submitting the access request in combination with the identity of the resource to

Art Unit: 2136

determine if the requestor using the role identity can access the resource (see also column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claims 12 and 30, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the selected set of rules is arranged hierarchically such that rules containing rule operations that are more specific are performed before rules containing rule operations that are more general such that placement of the disregard instruction in one of the at least one rules in the selected set of rules causes the step of performing to control an amount of access control provided to the requestor that submitted the access request for access to the resource (see column 15, lines 28-34 and column 11, lines 11-23; see also column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claims 13 and 31, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the disregard instruction is a conditional instruction that has a condition that must be met before the disregard instruction is performed (see column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claims 14 and 32, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein at least one rule in the selected set of rules contains a relation that defines a condition based on a group definition; and wherein at least one of the steps of selecting and performing includes the step of performing the relation to determine if at least one of a requestor, an access, and a resource specified in the access request satisfy the condition based on the group definition (see column 26, lines 30-67).

**As per claims 15, 33, and 43, Bapat et al.** discloses method for determining an authorization state of an access control system in a computing system environment, the method comprising the steps of receiving an access request (see column 27, lines 45-49); determining at least one of: i) an identity of the resource in the computing system environment to which the access request is directed (see column 26, lines 30-40); and ii) a role identity of a requestor submitting the access request; and applying at least one filter operation, based on at least one of the identity of the resource and the role identity of a requestor, to an at least one master set of rules to produce a list of rules to which the at least one filter operation matches in order to provide an indication of the authorization state of an access control system in a computing system environment as related to at least one of the identity of the resource and the role identity of a requestor (see column 26, lines 30-40 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claims 16 and 34, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of applying at least one filter operation applies a filter operation to determine what rules in the at least one master set of rules affect access to what resource in the computing system environment (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claims 17, 35, and 42, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of applying at least one filter operation applies a filter operation to determine what rules in the at least one master set of rules affect what at least one requestor can do to at least one resource in the computing system environment (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claims 18 and 36, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of applying at least one filter operation applies a filter operation to determine access control operations that a requestor can do to at least one resource in the computing system environment (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claims 37 and 44, Bapat et al.** discloses method providing access control to an resource in a computing system environment, the method comprising the steps of receiving an access request from a requestor requesting access to a resource in the computing system environment and determining a role identity associated with the requestor requesting access to the resource (see column 26, lines 30-40); and processing the access request in relation to a rule set based on an identity of the resource in the computing system environment to which the requestor requested access and based on the role identity associated with the requestor to determine if the requestor is allowed access the resource (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.); and wherein the rule set includes a plurality of rules, each rule including a filter operation, and wherein the step of processing determines if a rule applies to the resource in the computing system environment to which the requestor requested access based on the filter operation (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.); and wherein at least one rule in the rule set includes a disregard instruction, and wherein if the step of processing determines, based on the filter operation that the rule including the disregard instruction applies to the resource in the computing system environment to which the requestor requested access, the step of processing processes the rule

Art Unit: 2136

including the disregard instruction to limit performance of any remaining rule operations in the selected set of rules (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

**As per claim 45, Bapat et al.** discloses a method for controlling applicability of rule operations in a rule-based access control system, the method comprising the step of selecting at least one rule for performance to determine an access control decision; and performing a rule operation in the at least one rule, the rule operation including a disregard instruction that when performed, causes non-performance of at least one other rule operation in at least one rule that is selected for performance to determine the access control decision (see column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 28 and column 27, lines 50 et seq.).

6. **Claims 52-56** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,502,093 to **Bhatt et al.**.

6.1 **As per claim 45, Bhatt et al.** discloses receiving an access request; selecting subscription rule or array of rules containing multiple rules against stored subscription rules, and the subscription rule is performed in sequential order as shown in the example in columns 5-6 that meets the recitation of wherein the step of selecting a set of rules from at least one master set of rules includes selecting a set of rules containing multiple rules from at least one master set of rules, at least one of the multiple rules including multiple rule operations to be performed in sequential order, for example (see column 5, lines 1-16 and column 6, lines 26-46), the method

Art Unit: 2136

further comprising: for a given rule of the multiple rules: performing a filter operation associated with the given rule to identify whether to execute any rule operations in the given rule; and performing at least a portion of the multiple rule operations in sequential order to determine whether to provide access to a storage system in response to receiving the access request, for example (see column 6, line 26 through column 7, line 10).

**As per claim 53, Bhatt et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein the filter operation is an IF-THEN operation and performance of the IF-THEN operation provides an indication whether to perform at least one of the multiple rule operations in the given rule, for example (see column 5, line 50 through column 6, line 46).

**As per claims 54-55, Bhatt et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein performing at least a portion of the multiple rule operations in the given rule includes: performing a disregard instruction in the given rule that limits performance of other rule operations in the given rule, wherein the disregard instruction is a conditional disregard instruction, which when executed limits a performance of other rule operations in the given rule depending on occurrence of a corresponding condition, for example (see column 5, lines 1-16 and column 6, lines 50-67).

**As per claim 56, Bhatt et al.** discloses the limitation of further comprising: performing at least one other rule operation in the given rule after performing a conditional disregard instruction, for example (see column 6, lines 50-67).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.1 **Claims 46-51 and 57** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,236,996 to **Bapat et al.** in view of US Patent 6,502,093 to **Bhatt et al.**

7.2 **As per claim 46, Bapat et al.** substantially teaches the claimed method of claimed 1. **Bapat et al.** discloses when the user access request is a select statement, it invokes a control access procedure that uses a set of access rights stored in at least one permissions table... for instance (see claim 9) which meets the recitation of selecting set of rules. The Office action recites column 11, lines 51-67 and column 27 showing that the grant rules and deny rules meet the recitation of selected set of rules as disclosed by **Bapat et al.** "this structure makes it easy to define set of access rules" (column 12, lines 1-5). **Bapat et al.** discloses permission tables with multiple rules and the deny entries and grant entries are performed in order in column 27, lines 45 through column 28, line 55. Bapat discloses performing a filter operation associated with the



Art Unit: 2136

given rule to identify whether to execute any rule operations in the given rule; and performing at least a portion of the multiple rule operations in sequential order to determine whether to provide access to a storage system in response to receiving the access request, for example (see column 27, lines 45 through column 28, line 55). **Bhatt et al.** in an analogous art teaches selecting subscription rule or array of rules containing multiple rules against stored subscription rules, and the subscription rule is performed in sequential order as shown in the example in columns 5-6 that meets the recitation of wherein the step of selecting a set of rules from at least one master set of rules includes selecting a set of rules containing multiple rules from at least one master set of rules, at least one of the multiple rules including multiple rule operations to be performed in sequential order, for example (see column 5, lines 1-16 and column 6, lines 26-46), the method further comprising: for a given rule of the multiple rules: performing a filter operation associated with the given rule to identify whether to execute any rule operations in the given rule; and performing at least a portion of the multiple rule operations in sequential order to determine whether to provide access to a storage system in response to receiving the access request, for example (see column 6, line 26 through column 7, line 10). **Bhatt et al.** discloses a relational database system that is advantageous as it can be used for sophisticated filtering of rules and all standard database features are supported. Also, the invention can be used for request of messages as well as to produce messages, for example (see column 2, lines 64 through column 3, line 37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Bapat et al.** to provide a relational database system as taught by **Bhatt et al.** This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Bhatt et al.** so as to provide a

relational database system that can be used for sophisticated filtering of rules and all standard database features are supported and can be used for request of messages as well as to produce messages.

**As per claim 47, Bapat et al.** substantially teaches the limitation of wherein the filter operation is an IF-THEN operation and performance of the IF-THEN operation provides an indication whether to perform at least one of the multiple rule operations in the given rule, for example (see column 13, line 31-40 and column 27, lines 45 through column 28, line 55). **Bhatt et al.** also discloses wherein the filter operation is an IF-THEN operation and performance of the IF-THEN operation , for example (see column 5, line 50 through column 6, line 46).

**As per claims 48-49,** both references teach the limitation of wherein performing at least a portion of the multiple rule operations in the given rule includes: performing a disregard instruction in the given rule that limits performance of other rule operations in the given rule, wherein the disregard instruction is a conditional disregard instruction, which when executed limits a performance of other rule operations in the given rule depending on occurrence of a corresponding condition. **Bapat et al.** discloses performing the steps of access control rules based on permission tables in a hierarchical order unless a grant or deny decision is reached in any one step, that meets the recitation of performing less than all rule operations ... until reaching a disregard instruction thereby terminating any remaining rule operations. For instance, when reaching denying to all objects rule, there is no need to check denying to specific object

Art Unit: 2136

rule, for example (see **Bapat et al.**, column 27, lines 45 through column 28, line 55). See also for example (**Bhatt et al.**, column 5, lines 1-16 and column 6, lines 50-67).

**As per claim 50, Bhatt et al.** discloses the limitation of further comprising: performing at least one other rule operation in the given rule after performing a conditional disregard instruction, for example (see column 6, lines 50-67). Therefore, claim 50 is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 46.

**As per claims 51 and 57, Bapat et al.** discloses the limitation of wherein performance of the IF-THEN operation includes identifying whether an application generating the access request uses a particular resource in the storage system as well as whether a requestor associated with the access request is a member of a particular specified group and, if so, performing the rule operations in the given rule, for example (see column 9, lines 45-61 and column 18, lines 19-27).

### ***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2136

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8.1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 703-305-0355. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

*cc*

Carl Colin

Patent Examiner

August 4, 2004

*E. L. Moise*  
**EMMANUEL L. MOISE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*A/U 2136*